

REMARKS

Independent Claims 1 and 17 are amended in an effort to define patentable subject matter over the new ground of rejection. Several dependent claims are also amended for consistency of nomenclature. Claims 12, 47 and 48 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1-11, 13-19, and 21-32 remain, with no claim previously allowed.

Claims 1, 4-8, 12-15, 17-19, 21, 22, 26, 31, 32, 47, and 48 stand rejected as unpatentable over newly-cited *Hanson* (US 6,868,074) in view of *Urban* (US 6,233,329). The Applicants respectfully traverse that rejection as possibly applied to the amended claims.

The rejection characterizes *Hanson* as disclosing a method for providing a service that delivers the geographic location of a calling party on a VOIP phone. However, a close reading of the reference does not support that interpretation. *Hanson*, in Fig. 1, discloses a system including a mobile data device 12 such as a PDA "for communicating using Voice over Internet Protocol" (column 3, lines 31-35), as the rejection suggests. However, *Hanson* explicitly states (column 3, lines 48-51) that "the data device 12 is not configured for use with a cellular telephone network, and is not a cell phone but instead is a PDA or organizer type of device" (emphasis added). *Hanson* thus discloses internet-protocol addressing for sending messages between a PDA and, e.g., an emergency service provider 50, but that reference does not disclose a method or apparatus for transmitting a call of a calling party on a VOIP phone and related elements as claimed.

Fig. 6 of *Hanson* confirms the absence of teaching a VOIP phone-related system. In the embodiment of that figure, the caller's phone 154 is connected through the public

switched telephone network (PSTN) 48 to a user's phone 156, which forwards an incoming call to an answering machine 152 (assuming the user's phone is not answered). The locator service 156 receives geographical location information through the packet network 44, and the answering machine 152 communicates with that locator service to provide location information about the caller's phone (column 8, lines 48-60).

The rejection acknowledges that *Hanson* does not disclose several elements required for the method of Claim 1 or the system of Claim 17. Those elements missing from *Hanson* include triggering a query from a network element associated with the called party, retrieving geographic location information associated with the calling party in response to the query, returning the geographic location information to the network element, and terminating the call and delivering the geographic location information to the called party. However, *Urban* is cited as teaching those elements in an "analogous art". In particular, the rejection asserts that *Urban* discloses retrieving geographic location information associated with the calling party "from an address database that stores the calling party's IP identifier and geographic location information". However, *Urban* does not mention VOIP phones or transmitting a call from a calling party's IP network wherein data associated with the call includes an IP address of the calling parties. To the contrary, *Urban* discloses telecommunications using a switched telephone network (column 2, lines 3-55) for connecting a calling party to a called party as illustrated in Figure 1 of that reference. Accordingly, *Urban* fails to provide the teachings that the rejection attributes to that reference.

The Applicants submit that a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art would not have found it obvious to combine the teachings of *Urban* with those of *Hanson*, at least

in any way relevant to the presently- claimed invention. *Hanson's* primary teaching is providing a user with a PDA for relating medical information, including the user's geographical location, to an emergency service provider. The only mention of dial-up telephone service in *Hanson* uses the PSTN to connect a caller's phone with a user's phone (Fig. 6). Assuming for argument that one of ordinary skill might have conceivably used *Urban's* teachings for the PSTN element 48 of *Hanson*, that hypothetical combination would not have taught the claimed method or system of the present Applicants, including transmitting a call from a calling party on a VOIP phone to a called party, triggering a query from a network element associated with the called party, retrieving geographic location information associated from the calling party from an addressed database set stores the caller's IP address, corresponding directory number, and geographic location information, all in combination with other elements comprising the claimed invention. That combination of elements, as well as individual elements making up the claimed combination, come only from the present Applicants but not from the applied art. Accordingly, the claims are patentable over that art and the rejection should be withdrawn.

The claims depending from independent Claims 1 and 17 are patentable over the applied art for the reasons set forth above with regard to their respective parent claims. The additional secondary references *Alperovich* (US 6,185,426) applied to reject Claims 10 and 24; *Dzuban* (US 6,421,441) applied to reject Claim 2; *Valentine* (WO-99/27716) applied to reject Claims 11 and 28-30; *Dorenbosch* (US 6,505,049) applied to Claims 9, 25, and 27; and *LeBlanc* (US 5,596,625) applied to Claims 16 and 23, fail to supply the teachings missing from *Hanson* and *Urban*, and were not cited for that purpose.


S/N 09/630,134

Accordingly, those dependent claims are likewise allowable for the reasons set forth with regard to their respective parents.

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office action identified above. The Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance and solicit a notice to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD



Roger T. Frost
Reg. No. 22,176

Date: August 4, 2006

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

